

MEASURING THE IMPACT OF RETAIL MARIJUANA ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Presented by:

Robin Joy JD PhD

Director of Research

Crime Research Group, Inc.

robin@crgvt.org

WHO WE ARE

Serve as the State Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) under a contract with DPS.

Court Data: All filings and dispositions for: Criminal Court, Juvenile Court, Judicial Bureau, Civil Suspensions

NIBRS Data: National Incident Based Reporting Data- Crime/Arrest information

Criminal History Data - on a project needed basis

DOC - Public Use File

ED and Hosp discharge data

Technical Assistance

Research Partners for agencies/organizations

TYPES OF DATA AND SOURCES

Administrative Data

Created/collected/captured by administrative units for the purposes of carrying out the agency's mission (E.g., arrest information, court filings, DOC data)

Qualitative Data

observation, interviews, focus groups, sometimes surveys

Other Quantitative Data: Surveys, observations of quantifiable events (E.g., Date/Time, Vehicle Miles Traveled, Season)

WHEN TO USE ADMINISTRATIVE DATA

· Administrative Data is best to measure the "business" of the agency

AN INCREASE IN CRIME RATES IN THE DATA MAY NOT ACTUALLY INDICATE AN INCREASE IN CRIME.

- 1. There could be data quality issues
- 2. There could be workflow issues (court dispositions during 2020 were lower than normal. Not because of less crime, but because of COVID)
- 3. An increase may be the result of better trust between an agency and its constituents. (E.g., domestic violence/SA reporting)
 - 4. A policy change (see next slide)

MISDEMEANOR CHARGES DISPOSED 2010-2019

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Muni Ord	*	*	9	*	*	*	*			*
Fish and Game	186	140	104	145	142	174	132	169	220	191
Public Order	6602	6189	7348	7549	7176	6488	6755	6746	6009	6585
DMV- Other	4020	3963	4122	4225	4157	3934	3417	2941	2969	4071
Drugs	1805	1698	1857	<mark>1937</mark>	907	742	758	789	726	585
Fraud	358	429	408	354	346	269	268	250	168	208
Theft	2054	1898	2008	2219	2261	1912	2082	1760	1671	1642
GNO	205	209	217	259	249	280	379	459	405	396
DUI	3575	3343	3676	3710	3438	3352	3354	3182	3014	2866
Arson		*		*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Weapons		*	*	*		<u>*</u>	18	28	20	42
Assaults	1259	1252	1458	1492	1310	1229	1331	1267	1174	1113
VAPO	438	483	468	513	441	402	443	405	459	452
Domestic	1021	1058	1059	1120	931	989	968	900	840	894
Sex Offenses	56	60	82	44	41	76	76	72	60	70

WHEN TO USE QUALITATIVE DATA

- When you want to hear from a particular group about their experiences or perceptions (E.g., growers experiences in the licensing experience vs. retail workers experience/perceptions of their personal safety whilst working)
- When you want policy solutions that won't be available in the administrative data (E.g., bus stops and bathrooms)
- When there is little empirical data for your topic (it will be at least 5 years after the first store opens for you to have a decent N for quantitative analysis)
- To ensure the stories of the under-represented are analyzed with the same rigor as the quantitative data (see next slide)

NUMBER OF UNIQUE DOCKETS DISPOSED BY COUNTY

(* = 5 OR FEWER)

			Dispostitio	ns by Cour	nty 2015-2	2019 (Unique	Dockets)						
	Race												
Countyin	Missing	Black	Asian	White	Latinx	Indigenous	Multiracial	Not Reported	Other	Unkown			
Addison	268	72	10	2013	27	*		49		140			
Bennington	508	245	<mark>22</mark>	4742	29	*		90	8	35			
Caledonia	164	75	7	3329	10			36	*	34			
Chittenden	2378	<mark>1914</mark>	<mark>391</mark>	15395	<mark>99</mark>	<mark>19</mark>	14	370	26	56			
Essex	40	*		437				*		9			
Franklin	662	197	21	5422	13			1000	13	250			
Grand Isle	19	10	*	513	*	*		*		17			
Lamoille	240	46	6	1746	15			80	*	24			
Orange	191	27	*	2027	9			16	*	*			
Orleans	185	73	6	2747	22			97	*	43			
Rutland	768	<mark>311</mark>	12	5700	53			104	8	42			
Washington	489	286	19	6494	55	8		35	*	127			
Windham	222	<mark>427</mark>	24	6015	8 <mark>2</mark>			24	*	63			
Windsor	364	176	30	5402		 	*	73	*	88			

SENTENCE DISTRIBUTIONS - CHITTENDEN SENTENCED NO WHITE DEFENDANTS TO INCARCERATION FOR 2.5 GM OR MORE AND 12 CHARGES FOR BLACK DEFENDANTS. CHITTENDEN AND WINDHAM BOTH SENTENCED 9 CHARGES OF BLACK DEFENDANTS TO INCARCERATION FOR LESS THAN 2.5 GM.

	Chgcode2	Sentence	Black	White	Offname2	Chgcode2	Sentence	Black	White
ION 2.5	18V4231A2	Deferred	2.86%	20.83%	COCAINE-POSSESSION 2.5 GM OR MORE	18V4231A2	Deferred	*	10
GM OR MORE		Incarceration	85.71%	50.00%			Incarceration	3	0 24
		Probation	2.86%	16.67%			Probation	*	8
		Split Sentence	8.57%	12.50%			Split Sentence	*	6
ION LESS	S 18V4231A1	Deferred	3.28%	3.41%	COCAINE-POSSESSION LESS THAN 2.5 GM	18V4231A1	Deferred	*	9
		Fine Only	16.39%	14.39%			Fine Only	1	0 38
		Incarceration	47.54%	43.18%			Incarceration	2	9 114
		Probation	26.23%	27.65%			Probation	1	6 73
		Split Sentence	6.56%	11.36%			Split Sentence	*	30
		ION 2.5 18V4231A2	ION 2.5 18V4231A2 Deferred Incarceration Probation Split Sentence ION LESS 18V4231A1 Deferred Fine Only Incarceration Probation Split	ION 2.5 18V4231A2 Deferred Incarceration Probation 2.86% 85.71% Probation Split Sentence 8.57% 8.57% ION LESS 18V4231A1 Deferred 3.28% Fine Only 16.39% Incarceration 47.54% Probation 26.23% Split 6.56%	ION 2.5 18V4231A2 Deferred 2.86% 20.83% Incarceration Probation 2.86% 16.67% Split Sentence ION LESS 18V4231A1 Deferred 3.28% 3.41% Fine Only 16.39% 14.39% Incarceration 47.54% 43.18% Probation 26.23% 27.65% Split 6.56% 11.36%	ION 2.5 18V4231A2 Deferred	ION 2.5 18V4231A2 Deferred Incarceration Probation 2.86% 16.67% Split Sentence ION LESS 18V4231A1 Deferred 3.28% 3.41% Fine Only Incarceration Probation 26.23% 27.65% Split Split 6.56% 11.36% COCAINE-POSSESSION 2.5 18V4231A2 GM OR MORE COCAINE-POSSESSION 2.5 18V4231A2 GM OR MORE	ION 2.5	ION 2.5

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS VS. TESTIMONY

QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

- Overseen by an Ethics panel to protect participants
- Analyzed for themes, by multiple trained researchers. Often using computer software designed for qualitative analysis
- More freedom to recruit participants
- Participants are paid for their time
- Protection for emotional trauma and confidentiality

TESTIMONY TO PUBLIC BODIES

- Not focused on witnesses' rights/comfort/harm reduction
- Testimony is often limited in time
- Activists provide canned speeches which remove nuance
- Rarely is there systemic analysis of the stories or analysis of whose stories are missing

A NOTE ON SURVEYS

- Sampling is an issue in Vermont
- We miss the Castleton Polling Institute
- Explore buying questions on other surveys where statisticians have done the sampling math (E.g., Behavioral Risk, Youth Risk, YouGov)
- Have any survey designed looked over by a professional researcher for inconsistencies, privacy issues, ethics issues etc.

COLORADO'S RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

- https://cdpsdocs.state.co.us/ors/docs/reports/2021-SB13-283_Rpt.pdf
- Above link is to their 2021 report that was mandated by their legislature after retail sales were authorized.
- The legislature mandated data that do not exist or have no meaning be reported on. For example, they
 mandated: Marijuana-initiated contacts by law enforcement, broken down by judicial district and by race
 and ethnicity.
- From the report Marijuana-initiated contacts "is not a term used by any law enforcement agency, nor is contact data (for any purpose) collected systematically by law enforcement agencies. Further, S.B. 13-283 required contact data to be disaggregated by race/ethnicity, and it is not known how a law enforcement officer would determine race/ethnicity of individuals involved in a marijuana-initiated contact. In sum, this information does not exist and therefore cannot be included in this analysis" pg. 19

COLORADO EXPERIENCE CONTINUED

Was mandated to collect information that wasn't defined or centrally collected
 Crime near a marijuana retail establishment?

What is meant by "near"? How do the police capture that call in the CAD/RMS? Can the system extract that information. (Hint: you need a committee to decide and agree on this, and then an agreement to revisit the agreement because someone will put a store where you didn't think one would be and now the measurements are off)

Other info that was difficult for CO: DUI in their court data don't distinguish what kind of drug or alcohol (same here), no central repository for postal crimes, probation data was not available.

THE VT CANNABIS BOARD DATA

- Approach your data systems and data collection about your activity with an eye towards equity, transparency and mapping to other systems.
- Design your forms, databases etc. with an eye towards a future evaluation of your performance. Including principles of Results Based Accountability ™, Equity Analysis, and other appropriate/necessary evaluative measures.

WHAT CAN VT DO?

Proof of concept in 2017- I've already confirmed (with my NU class) that we can replicate Colorado's available data sources

Form a stakeholders' group for data metrics which includes: the tech folks, practitoners, researchers, community members. What do we want to measure? Can we? What will it cost? Etc.

Plan for a Qualitative research by identifying questions, funding sources and researchers to carry it out.

Might also consider a process evaluation of the Board.

Be flexible, be creative and start now. ©